



STATE OF WASHINGTON

**FREIGHT MOBILITY STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD**

1063 Capitol Way, Rm. 201 • PO Box 40965 • Olympia, WA 98504-0965 • (360) 586-9695 • FAX (360) 586-9700

**RECEIVED**

**MAY 12 2006**

**AWVSP Team Office**

Patricia Otley,  
Chair

May 9, 2006

Mark Asmundson

Cliff Benson

Rebecca Francik

Andrew Johnsen

Ross Kelley

Don Lemmons

Doug MacDonald

Dick Marzano

Jim Toomey

Jennifer Ziegler

Karen Schmidt,  
Executive Director

David Dye  
WA State Department of Transportation  
Urban Corridors Office Administrator  
Wells Fargo Building  
999 Third Avenue, Suite 3230  
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Mr. Dye:

When the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) learned of your April 25 letter regarding the SR 519 Project requesting stakeholder concurrence in project direction by May 12, we were surprised and disappointed.

First, the deadline does not allow us to officially comment until after our Board next meets on May 19. FMSIB is most definitely an interested stakeholder in the project and has been so since 1998 when the agency was created and SR-519 became its #1 priority freight mobility project in the State. We have discussed the project's progress and shared our comments on the project on many occasions and certainly want to participate in your current exercise. The subject will be on our May 19 agenda and we will provide additional written comments to you after that.

Prior to that and based upon our Board's many previous discussions, I feel confident in offering the following comments.

You have put forth only two options for consideration, termed "Go" and "No-Go". This is unacceptable from several perspectives. First, we are not aware that the S. Royal Brougham Way design has been "abandoned" or that it has ever been declared "infeasible" from a design point of view.

Secondly, neither of the options you offer guarantees that the freight mobility goals of the original project will be realized. Concerns about impediments to the movement of freight, about the impact on our region's and State's ability to maintain market share in an increasingly competitive international marketplace,

and about the great growth of freight movement in that area of Seattle are what drove the need for the project. And, not coincidentally, pledged freight improvements are what attracted the major financial partners in the project. It seems clear that only significant freight improvements will assure their continued participation.

Third, each of the other routes the feasibility study is considering is enormously more expensive and potentially considerably less efficient for the movement of freight. Both of these factors deserve serious examination which needs to include the involvement of the modes which move freight, those which need to receive and forward freight (the Port of Seattle, among others), and those interests who will fund the project. Raising significantly more funding for a project which costs more and brings fewer benefits would be challenging indeed.

Lastly, a "No-Go" option is untenable from every perspective. Freight, like water, seeks the path of least resistance. If Seattle offers too much of it, freight will go elsewhere and the regional and State economy will suffer. If the unsafe conditions at Royal Brougham are allowed to continue, tragedy will occur and questions of liability will abound. Delaying a project until after Alaskan Way Viaduct work is completed would be folly.

At FMSIB we are willing and anxious to participate in any effort to see this project brought to its completion. We need to finish what was promised to the partners.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Patricia Otley".

Patricia Otley  
Chair

cc: Governor Christine Gregoire  
Chairman Mary Margaret Haugen – JTC